

REMARKS

This paper responds to the Office Action dated March 28, 2003.

The Examiner has rejected all pending claims on the view that they are supposedly anticipated, and indeed supposedly "clearly anticipated," by US Pat. No. 5,117,350 to Parrish et al. ("Parrish"). As the Examiner notes, Parrish has been of record since February 1, 2000 when it was disclosed by applicant in an Information Disclosure Statement.

It is true that there are some similarities between Parrish and the claimed invention. It is crucially important, however, to appreciate that there are important differences. The most important distinction is that in each pending claim, there is an express limitation that the processor elements are coupled by means of a message-passing communications network. In contrast, the processor elements of Parrish are coupled by means of a bus.

Two new claims 33 and 34 have been added which are intended to be identical to pending claims 16 and 21, but with some added language emphasizing the coupling through a message-passing network. The Examiner is requested to consider these claims and to acknowledge that they are novel over Parrish.

The Examiner is respectfully reminded that both the terms "bus" and "message-passing communications network" are used in the claims and were used in the application as filed. If the two terms were synonymous (which is what would need to be the case for Parrish to anticipate the pending claims) then there would have been no need for applicant to use such distinct terms in the application as filed.

The Examiner is also respectfully directed to the places in the pending claims where the limitation (of the coupling through the message-passing communications network) may be found, a limitation not found in Parrish. These are as follows:

- in claims 16, 26 and 27 at line 7, and again in the "propagating" and "receiving" steps;

- in claims 21, 28 and 29 at line 7, and again in the first means and in the second means.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to note that each pending independent claim (16, 21, 26, 27, 28, and 29) there are at least two express limitations about coupling through a message-passing communications network, and that neither of these limitations may be found in Parrish.

By way of background it is mentioned that as is well known to those skilled in the art, a message-passing network is more complex and is different from a simple bus. For example, scalability is greater for a message-passing network, and sub-groups and sub-networks can be established. In a bus, mutual influences can happen such as interference and contention for the medium.

Although the Examiner has not said that the claims are obvious over Parrish, it is noted that it would not be obvious to the skilled person to implement the system of Parrish on a message passing communications network, since Parrish teaches away. Parrish exclusively teaches the use of an interconnect bus. Applicant has reviewed the other cited art and has likewise been able to find a teaching toward the claimed limitation, and has likewise been unable to identify any combination of references which would render the claimed invention obvious.

Reconsideration and allowance is requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Carl Oppedahl
PTO Reg. No. 32,746
Oppedahl & Larson LLP
P O Box 5068
Dillon, CO 80435-5068
email oppedahl@patents.com

OFFICIAL

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

SEP 29 2003